UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,913	03/08/2002	Wenhao Hsieh	HSIE3025/EM	1298

23364 7590 03/25/2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
WANG, JIN CHENG	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2672	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/092,913	Applicant(s) HSIEH, WENHAO
	Examiner Jin-Cheng Wang	Art Unit 2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 10 recites "The method as claimed in claim 10" which should be "The method as claimed in claim 9". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 10 recites "The method as claimed in claim 10" which should be "The method as claimed in claim 9". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barnes U.S. Patent No. 5,952,995 (hereinafter Barnes).

5. Claim 1:

Barnes teaches a method of scrolling a display of an information apparatus, the scrolling corresponding to movement of a cursor, a user controlling movement of the cursor in an active window via an input device, the method comprising:

Step A: receiving a cursor-moving signal (detection of scrolling indicating cursor movement in step 602 of Figure 6; See also column 7, lines 32-67);

Step B: determining if the position of the cursor will be out of the active window (determining the scrolling indicating cursor's new location and determining if a portion of the scrolling indicating cursor extends beyond the display edge; column 7, lines 32-67); if it is not, then proceeding the step C, and if it is, then proceeding the step D (e.g., column 7, lines 32-67);

Step C: moving the cursor (See the scrolling indicating cursor's relative positions in the display of the active window in Figures 4A and Figure 4B); and

Step D: Scrolling the active window along the moving direction of the cursor (Step 608 of Figure 6 which illustrates scrolling the display in the direction of the indicator and proportionately moving the scrolling indicating cursor away from the display edge; See also column 7, lines 32-67).

6. Claim 11:

Barnes teaches a set top box for receiving network signals to link to a website and outputting an image signal to a television, a user capable of viewing content of the website via the television, the set top box providing an input device for the user to control movement of the a cursor in an active window display, the set top box comprising the following conditions:

Condition 1: moving the cursor if the sequential movement of the cursor will not cause the cursor to move out of the active window (See the scrolling indicating cursor's relative positions in the display of the active window in Figures 4A and Figure 4B); and

Condition 2: scrolling the window display along the direction of movement of the cursor if the sequential movement of the cursor will cause the cursor to move out of the active window (Step 608 of Figure 6 which illustrates scrolling the display in the direction of the indicator and proportionately moving the scrolling indicating cursor away from the display edge; See also column 7, lines 32-67).

Claim 16:

The Claim 16 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of the Claim 11 except additional claim limitation of the input device being a remote control and the remote control having a cursor direction button for the user to control the cursor. However, Barnes further discloses the claim limitation of the input device being a remote control and the remote control having a cursor direction button for the user to control the cursor (Figure 1D).

7. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kurakake U.S. Patent No. 4,734,689 (hereinafter Kurakake).

Kurakake teaches a method of scrolling a display of an information apparatus, the scrolling corresponding to movement of a cursor, a user controlling movement of the cursor in an active window via an input device, the method comprising:

Step A: receiving a cursor-moving signal (scrolling operation in response to the cursor up or down movement command signal; see column 11);

Step B: determining if the position of the cursor is within a predetermined region of the active window (determining if *the cursor position has not reached the range within 3 lines from the upper or lower ends of the screen*, the cursor is successively moved each time the cursor movement key is operated, and reaches the boundary of the predetermined range; column 11); if it is not, then proceeding the step C, and if it is, then proceeding the step D (e.g., column 11);

Step C: moving the cursor (determining if the cursor position has not reached the range within 3 lines from the upper or lower ends of the screen, *the cursor is successively moved* each time the cursor movement key is operated, and reaches the boundary of the predetermined range; column 11); and

Step D: Scrolling the active window along the moving direction of the cursor (When the cursor has reached the boundary of the 3-line range, display controller 2 checks if displayed data is present on the line in memory 3 corresponding to the content of register SLR+30. If so detected, the content of register SLR is incremented by one, and *the detected data is displayed.* Thus the displayed data is scrolled upward by one line while the cursor position is retained on the 28th line of the screen. See column 11).

Claim 7:

The Claim 7 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of the Claim 6 except additional claim limitation of the scrolling distance being a half page.

However, Kurakake further discloses the claim limitation of the scrolling distance being a half page (Kurakake column 11).

Claim 8:

The Claim 8 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of the Claim 6 except additional claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor. However, Kurakake further discloses the claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor (Kurakake column 4, lines 30-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes U.S. Patent No. 5,952,995 (hereinafter Barnes) in view of Kurakake U.S. Patent No. 4,734,689 (hereinafter Kurakake).

Claim 2:

(a) The claim 2 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of the scrolling distance being a half page.

(b) Barnes meets the claim limitation set forth in the Claim 1. However, Barnes does not implicitly teach the scrolling distance being a half page.

(c) Kurakake teaches the claim limitation of the scrolling distance being a multiple lines (Kurakake column 11)

(d) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kurakake's scrolling distance being a half page and incorporated Kurakake's scrolling distance into the Barnes's method because Barnes teaches scrolling the remaining content and Kurakake teaches scrolling a line or more lines and therefore suggesting an obvious modification (Barnes column 6-7 and Kurakake column 11).

(e) Such modification would have been required to provide an alternative scrolling distance as what has been taught by Kurakake (scrolling distance being a multiple lines).

10. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes U.S. Patent No. 5,952,995 (hereinafter Barnes), in view of Kurakake U.S. Patent No. 4,734,689 (hereinafter Kurakake).

11. Claim 3:

(a) The claim 3 encompasses the same scope of invention as the Claim 1 except additional claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor.

(b) However, Barnes does not implicitly teach placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor.

(c) Kurakake teaches the claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor (Kurakake column 4, lines 30-45).

(d) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Kurakake's cursor being placed at a middle position of the window being scrolled into the Barnes's method because Barnes suggests a determination of the scrolling indicator cursor's new location (Barnes column 7) and therefore suggesting the cursor can be placed at the center of the active window (Barnes column 6).

(e) Such modification would have been required to provide a fixed cursor position when additional information being scrolled.

12. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes U.S. Patent No. 5,952,995 (hereinafter Barnes) in view of Gest et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,333,247 (hereinafter Gest).

Claim 4:

(a) The claim 4 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of the scrolling distance equal to the preset value when the remaining content exceeds the size of the display and the scrolling distance equal to the preset value when the remaining content being less than the size of the display screen.

(b) Barnes meets the claim limitation set forth in the Claim 1. However, Barnes lacks a full disclosure of the claim limitation of the scrolling distance equal to the preset value when the remaining content exceeds the size of the display and the scrolling distance being less than the preset value when the remaining content being less than the size of the display screen.

(c) Gest teaches the claim limitation of the scrolling distance equal to the preset value (scrolling distance equal to the full page) when the remaining content exceeds the size of the display and the scrolling distance being less than the preset value (no scrolling when there is no remaining content) when the remaining content being less than the size of the display screen (Gest column 8).

(d) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Gest's scrolling distance into the Barnes's method because Barnes teaches scrolling a line which is a predetermined value and no scrolling when the cursor's position is within the display window and naturally zero scrolling when there is no additional information to be displayed (Barnes column 7) and therefore suggesting the scrolling logic (Barnes column 6-7).

(e) Such modification would have been required to provide an alternative scrolling logic.

13. Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes U.S. Patent No. 5,952,995 (hereinafter Barnes) in view of Gest et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,333,247 (hereinafter Gest), and Kurakake U.S. Patent No. 4,734,689 (hereinafter Kurakake).

Claim 5:

(a) Claim 5 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of the Claim 4 (which has been taught by Barnes/Gest) except additional claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor.

(b) However, Barnes/Gest is silent to placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor.

(c) Kurakake teaches the claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor (Kurakake column 4, lines 30-45).

(d) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Kurakake's cursor being placed at a middle position of the window being scrolled into the Barnes/Gest's method because Barnes suggests a determination of the scrolling indicator cursor's new location and therefore suggesting the cursor can be placed at the center of the active window (Barnes column 6-7).

(e) Such modification would have been required to provide a fixed cursor position when additional information being scrolled.

14. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurakake U.S. Patent No. 4,734,689 (hereinafter Kurakake), in view of Gest et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,333,247 (hereinafter Gest).

Claim 9:

(a) The Claim 9 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of the Claim 6 except additional claim limitation of the scrolling distance equal to the preset value when the remaining content exceeds the size of the display and the scrolling distance equal to the preset value when the remaining content being less than the size of the display screen.

(b) Kurakake meets the claim limitation set forth in the Claim 6. However, Kurakake lacks a full disclosure of the claim limitation of the scrolling distance equal to the preset value when the remaining content exceeds the size of the display and the scrolling distance being less than the preset value when the remaining content being less than the size of the display screen.

(c) Gest teaches the claim limitation of the scrolling distance equal to the preset value (scrolling distance equal to the full page) when the remaining content exceeds the size of the display and the scrolling distance being less than the preset value (no scrolling when there is no remaining content) when the remaining content being less than the size of the display screen (Gest column 8).

(d) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Gest's scrolling distance into the Kurakake's method because Kurakake teaches scrolling a line which is a predetermined value and no scrolling when the cursor's position is within the display window and naturally zero scrolling when there is no additional information to be displayed (Kurakake column 11) and therefore suggesting the scrolling logic (Kurakake column 11).

(e) Such modification would have been required to provide an alternative scrolling logic.

Claim 10:

The Claim 10 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of the Claim 9 (which has been taught by Kurakake /Gest) except additional claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor. However,

Kurakake teaches the claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor (Kurakake column 4, lines 30-45).

15. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes U.S. Patent No. 5,952,995 (hereinafter Barnes) in view of Kurakake U.S. Patent No. 4,734,689 (hereinafter Kurakake).

Claim 12:

(a) The claim 12 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 11 except additional claimed limitation of the scrolling distance being a half page.

(b) Barnes meets the claim limitation set forth in the Claim 11. However, Barnes does not implicitly teach the scrolling distance being a half page.

(c) Kurakake teaches the claim limitation of the scrolling distance being a multiple lines (Kurakake column 11)

(d) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kurakake's scrolling distance being a half page and incorporated Kurakake's scrolling distance into the Barnes's method because Barnes teaches scrolling the remaining content and Kurakake teaches scrolling a line or more lines and therefore suggesting an obvious modification (Barnes column 6-7 and Kurakake column 11).

(e) Such modification would have been required to provide an alternative scrolling distance as what has been taught by Kurakake (scrolling distance being a multiple lines).

16. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes U.S. Patent No. 5,952,995 (hereinafter Barnes), in view of Kurakake U.S. Patent No. 4,734,689 (hereinafter Kurakake).

Claim 13:

(a) The claim 13 encompasses the same scope of invention as the Claim 11 except additional claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor.

(b) However, Barnes does not implicitly teach placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor.

(c) Kurakake teaches the claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor (Kurakake column 4, lines 30-45).

(d) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Kurakake's cursor being placed at a middle position of the window being scrolled into the Barnes's method because Barnes suggests a determination of the scrolling indicator cursor's new location (Barnes column 7) and therefore suggesting the cursor can be placed at the center of the active window (Barnes column 6).

(e) Such modification would have been required to provide a fixed cursor position when additional information being scrolled.

17. Claims 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes U.S. Patent No. 5,952,995 (hereinafter Barnes) in view of Gest et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,333,247 (hereinafter Gest).

Claim 14:

(a) The claim 14 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 11 except additional claimed limitation of the scrolling distance equal to the preset value when the remaining content exceeds the size of the display and the scrolling distance equal to the preset value when the remaining content being less than the size of the display screen.

(b) Barnes meets the claim limitation set forth in the Claim 11. However, Barnes lacks a full disclosure of the claim limitation of the scrolling distance equal to the preset value when the remaining content exceeds the size of the display and the scrolling distance being less than the preset value when the remaining content being less than the size of the display screen.

(c) Gest teaches the claim limitation of the scrolling distance equal to the preset value (scrolling distance equal to the full page) when the remaining content exceeds the size of the display and the scrolling distance being less than the preset value (no scrolling when there is no remaining content) when the remaining content being less than the size of the display screen (Gest column 8).

(d) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Gest's scrolling distance into the Barnes's method because Barnes teaches scrolling a line which is a predetermined value and no scrolling when the cursor's position is within the display window and naturally zero scrolling when there is no

additional information to be displayed (Barnes column 7) and therefore suggesting the scrolling logic (Barnes column 6-7).

(e) Such modification would have been required to provide an alternative scrolling logic.

18. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes U.S. Patent No. 5,952,995 (hereinafter Barnes) in view of Gest et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,333,247 (hereinafter Gest), and Kurakake U.S. Patent No. 4,734,689 (hereinafter Kurakake).

Claim 15:

(a) Claim 15 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of the Claim 14 (which has been taught by Barnes/Gest) except additional claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor.

(b) However, Barnes/Gest is silent to placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor.

(c) Kurakake teaches the claim limitation of placing the cursor at a middle position of the window being scrolled along the movement of the cursor (Kurakake column 4, lines 30-45).

(d) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Kurakake's cursor being placed at a middle position of the window being scrolled into the Barnes/Gest's method because Barnes suggests a determination of the scrolling indicator cursor's new location and therefore suggesting the cursor can be placed at the center of the active window (Barnes column 6-7).

(e) Such modification would have been required to provide a fixed cursor position when additional information being scrolled.

Conclusion

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jin-Cheng Wang whose telephone number is (703) 605-1213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Razavi can be reached on (703) 305-4713. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-6606 for regular communications and (703) 308-6606 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 395-3900.

jcw
March 22, 2004

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600